arXiv:1301.1541v1 [q-bio.BM] 8 Jan 2013

Reply to Comment on “Length Scale Dependence of DNA Mechanical Properties’

Agnes Noy and Ramin Golestanian
Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics, University of Oxford, 1 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3NP, UK

(Dated: January 9, 2013)

PACS numbers: 87.15.-v, 87.15.La, 87.14.-g, 82.39.Pj

In a Comment [1] on our recent study of the length scale dependence of DNA elasticity [2], Mazur brings up a number of technical points about the analysis of the MD trajectories used in our simulations, broadly categorized as concerns about equilibration and interpretation of the observed results.

First, we should clarify that we have eliminated a number of base pairs from the two ends for our analysis. The longest length that we considered for the 56mer was 43 bp, i.e. nearly 4 DNA helical turns, not 5. In the case of the 36mer, the longest length considered was 23 bp, i.e. nearly 2 DNA helical turns, not 3 (see the supplemental material in Ref. [2]).

To ensure that we are indeed probing equilibrium properties of DNA, we compare the results we obtain for the segment with 4 DNA turns to that with 2 DNA turns, and interpret their agreement as a sign of equilibration. The shorter segment (2 DNA turns), which we simulated and analyzed for 130 ns, safely falls within the time scale of equilibration, and so does most of the analysis for the longer segment (4 turns), with the possible exception of the bending mode which might be marginal (using the scaling forms for the relaxation time scale, namely L^2 for twist and L^4 for bending, as pointed out by Mazur [1]). We agree that a systematic and detailed analysis of the relaxation time scales of each mode in the system is desirable. However, the main aim of our study was probing length scale dependence, which is why we chose to use MD simulations (just pushing to their limits of validity) that we could use to study the equilibrium properties.

We have always been careful to avoid drawing conclusions only based on the information at the longest length scale. For instance, twist or contour-length elastic profiles from both fragments present the plateau at lengths shorter than a DNA turn, and bend modulations are uniformly distributed at all studied lengths. The only long-scale effect reported in our paper was the end-stretching mode, which is already present for the shorter segment, and does not directly involve bending. The choice of water model is also known to not affect the equilibrium properties: although the self-diffusion constant is smaller for SPC/E than for TIP3P water model, Noy et al found no significant influence of the water model over the internal dynamics of DNA [3].

The second group of concerns are about analysis of the results and their interpretations [1]. First, we consider our investigation into the possible origin of the longest-range effect, which is the end-to-end cooperativity. From the essential dynamics analysis we conclude that one of the main sources for this effect could be an end-stretching motion. Moreover, when we project all the trajectory over this essential mode, not only is the contour-length variability transformed from nearly linear to cooperative, but also the same happens when the local parameter rise is added, which is independent of bending (see Fig. S2 from [2]). We also identify a possible mode capable of differentiating the end-to-end and the contour length elastic behaviors at the shorter lengths where the most affected parameters are the inclination and the displacement with respect to a global molecular axis [4] (see Fig. S3 from [2]). This analysis together with the partial variance method should help to clear the concerns over the influence of bending over the end-to-end distance.

We agree that when we start from an atomistic resolution, the definition of the DNA axis on the bp-level can be somewhat arbitrary, as evident from the variety of the programs that exist for analyzing DNA structure. However, a work of comparison has been done revealing that with the exception of rise, the differences were insignificant, and thus the influence of either the choice of the reference frame or the mathematical algorithm were negligible [5]. Similar bending periodicity to what we report has been observed using FREEHELIX [6], CURVES [7] and Monte Carlo coarse-grained simulations over long molecules of DNA [8]. Moreover, Dickerson and coworkers described the same helical periodicity analyzing entirely experimental structures [6]. This effect is due entirely to the static structure of DNA, namely its spontaneous curvature. Because DNA is a twisted polymer, this periodicity emerges when a regular DNA with a systematic positive roll is built (blue line of Fig. 3c [2]).

We suspect the concerns about interpretation of the results and comparison to the wormlike rod model—as pointed out in Ref. [1]—have arisen from a misunderstanding of the main message of our work and the terminology we used in presenting them. We used the term “bending correlation” for the quantity correlation function between the tangent vectors at two points along the axis of the polymer. This is a standard definition and terminology in polymer physics, and is aimed at probing how much the orientation of the local axis at one point is “correlated” with the orientation at a different point. The main point of our results regarding bending is that due to a residual average static (helical) structure, this correlation function will have a periodic shape even at zero temperature and without any fluctuations. What we point out about definitions of persistence length from the decay of this function is aimed at alerting to the fact that using a local slope, as has been used in interpreting some experimental data, might give erroneous results due to this residual structure. From how we understand it, Mazur is also saying the same thing by producing the oscillations in Fig. 1 of the Comment [1]: we do not see a contradiction here. We certainly did not claim to have found long-range correlations in bending in contradiction to the wormlike rod model.

We have used MD simulations with a particular choice of force-fields and water model to study how the elastic properties of DNA depend on the length scale. Clearly, the actual values found in our simulations will depend on the choice of force-fields and water model, and inherit the corresponding strengths and weaknesses. We fully agree with the author that additional work is necessary to improve the MD force-fields and the statistics, and probe other aspects such as sequence effect. Moreover, continuous improvements of computational tools will allow us to explore larger systems and longer time scales. However, we believe that the main trends and qualitative features observed in our work should remain the same, and it is those trends and the origin of various effects (end-stretching, etc) that we consider to be the core result of our paper, not the actual values, which might be systematically overestimated by our choice of force-fields, and might change as the force-fields are improved over time.

Moreover, our simulations show that the scale of the correlations are relatively short, showing crossover between the base-pair step and bulk behavior within one helical DNA turn, with the exception of the end-stretching mode, which is in perfect agreement with Mazur [1]. For the reasons given here, we do not believe that the Comment provides any evidence against our work.

[1] A. K. Mazur, arXiv:1212.4733.
[2] A. Noy and R. Golestanian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 228101 (2012).
[3] A. Noy *et al.*, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **11**, 10596 (2009).
[4] R. Lavery *et al.*, Nuc. Acids. Res. **17**, 5917 (2009).
[5] Xiang-Jun Lu and Wilma Olson, J. Mol. Biol. **285**, 1563 (1999).
[6] R. E. Dickerson and T. K. Chiu, Biopolymers **44**, 361 (1997).
[7] A. Mazur, J. Phys. Chem. B **113**, 2077 (2009).
[8] R. C. Mauron and W. K. Olson, Biopolymers **27**, 585 (1988).